

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 11, 21, 23 and 24 have been amended by the present Amendment. Amended claims 1, 11, 21, 23 and 24 do not introduce any new subject matter.

OBJECTION TO THE CLAIMS

The Examiner objects to claims 1, 11, 21, 23 and 24 because “the one output port being the only destination port for the table is awkward.”

Without conceding the merits of the objection, Applicant has deleted the disputed phrase, and, accordingly, respectfully requests that the objection be withdrawn.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 11, 21, 23 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement, stating that the limitation that “one output is the only destination port for the table constitutes new matter”.

Without conceding the merits of the rejection, Applicant has deleted the disputed phrase, and, accordingly, respectfully requests that the rejection under section 112 be withdrawn.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 1-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,122,279 (“Milway”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,473,598 (“Takatori”).

The Examiner admits that Milway fails to teach a plurality of tables, each of which corresponds to one output port of a plurality of output ports, and relies on Takatori to

cure the deficiency in Milway.

However, in contrast to the claimed embodiments, Takatori fails to teach (1) locating a packet identifier from the plurality of packet identifiers stored in the plurality of tables that matches the packet identifier of the at least one packet by simultaneously searching each table for the packet identifier of the at least one packet, wherein the packet identifiers stored in each respective table are directed to the same output port, as essentially recited in amended claims 1, 23 and 24; (2) locating a cell identifier from the plurality of cell identifiers stored in each table that matches the cell identifier of the at least one cell by simultaneously searching each table for the cell identifier of the at least one cell, wherein the cell identifiers stored in each respective table are directed to the same output port, as essentially recited in claim 11; and (3) that the packet identifiers stored in each respective table are directed to the same output port and that each of the plurality of tables are simultaneously searched to locate a packet identifier from the plurality of packet identifiers stored in each table that matches the packet identifier of the at least one packet, as essentially recited in claim 21.

For example, Applicant's disclosure states that "each respective lookup table 60-63 stores only information for identifiers directed to a specific output port", and that "an identifier applied to the switching apparatus through an input port can be searched for in lookup tables of all output ports simultaneously, so that the time taken to search for a destination is substantially reduced." See, e.g., Applicant's disclosure, page 10, line 23 – page 11, line 9.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, there is no disclosure in Takatori of packet or cell identifiers stored in each respective routing table that are directed to the same output port.

Furthermore, unlike the claimed embodiments, Takatori requires selection of "active" routing tables, while the remaining tables are "stand-by" tables. See Takatori, Abstract, col. 3, lines 43-48, col. 4, lines 8-20. As such, Takatori fails to disclose or suggest the claimed simultaneous searching of each of the lookup tables for a matching packet or cell identifier.

Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 1, 11, 21, 23 and 24 are patentable over Milway in view of Takatori. For at least the reason that claims 2-10 depend from claim 1, claims 12-20 depend from claim 11, and claim 22 depends from claim 21, claims 2-10, 12-20 and 22 are also submitted to be patentable over the cited references.

As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

An early and favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner has any further questions or comments, the Examiner may telephone Applicants' Attorney to reach a prompt disposition of this application.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael F. Morano
Reg. No. 44,952
Attorney for Applicant

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, NY 11797
(516) 692-8888